



**The Task Force on Court Facilities**  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

**Meeting Report**

March 24 & 25, 1999  
Holiday Inn Airport, Fresno, CA

<p><b>ATTENDEES:</b></p> <p><b>TASK FORCE MEMBERS:</b></p> <p><b>PRESENT:</b> Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Chair Mr. Greg Abel Ms. Yvonne Campos Mr. John Clarke Mr. Mike Courtney Sheriff Robert T. Doyle Hon. Jerry Eaves Hon. Gary Freeman Mr. David Janssen Mr. Fred Klass Hon. Michael Nail Hon. Wayne Peterson Hon. Charles V. Smith Mr. Anthony Tyrrell Hon. Diane Elan Wick</p> <p><b>ABSENT:</b> Mr. Wylie Aitken Hon. Joan B. Bechtel Hon. Martha Escutia</p> <p><b>TASK FORCE STAFF:</b> Mr. Robert Lloyd, Project Manager / Senior Facilities Planner Mr. Bruce Newman, Facilities Planner Ms. Pat Bonderud, Facilities Planner Ms. Veronica Gomez, Staff Analyst</p>	<p><b>PRESENTERS:</b> Mr. Dan Smith, Daniel C. Smith &amp; Associates/Vitetta Group Mr. Andy Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson &amp; Mendenhall Mr. Don Dwore, Spillis Candela &amp; Partners Mr. Ken Jandura, Spillis Candela &amp; Partners Mr. Ernest Pauline, Fresno County Superior Court Mr. Mike Weinberg, Fresno County Superior Court Hon. James Ardaiz, Court of Appeal, 5<sup>th</sup> District Ms. Judy Myers, Administrative Office of the Courts</p> <p><b>CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE:</b> Mr. Andrew Cupples, Daniel, Mann, Johnson &amp; Mendenhall Mr. Jay Smith, Daniel, Mann, Johnson &amp; Mendenhall Ms. Kim Steinjann, Daniel, Mann, Johnson &amp; Mendenhall Ms. Kathleen Halaszynski, Daniel, Mann, Johnson &amp; Mendenhall Mr. Dan Smith, Daniel C. Smith &amp; Associates/Vitetta Group Ms. Kathy Bruns, Daniel C. Smith &amp; Associates/Vitetta Group Ms. Cathy Chynoweth, Daniel C. Smith &amp; Associates/Vitetta Group Mr. Thomas Gardner, Vitetta Group Ms. Kit Cole, Vitetta Group Mr. Cliff Woodard, Justice Planning Associates Mr. Don Dwore, Spillis Candela &amp; Partners Mr. Ken Jandura, Spillis Candela &amp; Partners</p> <p><b>GUESTS:</b> Ms. Cathy Knighten, Orange County Mr. Rick Dostal, Orange County Hon. Stephen Dombrink, Alameda County Superior Court Ms. Sue Bost, Department of Finance Mr. Stephen Demetras, San Joaquin County Superior Court Mr. Anthony Williams, Administrative Office of the Courts Mr. Frank Schultz, Administrative Office of the Courts Ms. Monica Driggers, Administrative Office of the Courts Mr. Art Gomez, San Bernardino County Mr. John Van Whervin, Los Angeles Superior Court Ms. Beverly Bickel, Omni Group, Inc.</p>
---	--

## **DAY 1 – Wednesday, March 24, 1999**

### **I. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME – Justice Daniel Kremer**

- 1) Justice Kremer opened the Task Force meeting at 10:00 AM.
- 2) The Task Force reviewed and unanimously approved the meeting report from the January 1999 Task Force meeting.
- 3) There were not enough members present at the end of the January 1999 meeting to form a quorum. Consequently, no formal action was taken to approve the draft courtroom guidelines and Task Force revisions. Justice Kremer asked for a motion to approve the courtroom guideline and revisions.
- 4) The need for this motion was discussed as follows:
  - a) Judge Peterson reported that San Diego Superior Court's architect, Ming Yim, reviewed the proposed guidelines and had a number of suggested revisions. The Standards/Evaluation Committee or the Task Force has not reviewed Mr. Yim's suggestions. Judge Peterson felt that a motion to approve the draft courtroom guidelines and changes should be held until this information was presented.
  - b) Supervisor Smith noted that the CSAC Advisory Committee has the the draft of the courtroom guidelines but has not yet reviewed it.
  - c) Mr. Lloyd said that the consultants and staff were seeking approval of the format and relative depth and detail of the proposed guidelines only. Further discussion of the specific content on the courtroom component is scheduled for the current Task Force meeting. He also noted that the four working groups chartered by the Standards and Evaluation Committee (Technology, Security, Unification and Appellate Court Standards) are working independently of staff and will likely recommend additional changes to the draft guidelines.
  - d) Supervisor Smith commented that there is some confusion as to whether the Judicial Council's existing standards remain in effect or if guidelines recommended by the Task Force replace the Council's and/or serve a separate purpose.
  - e) Supervisor Eaves wanted to ensure that the draft guidelines could be amended in the future to reflect the outcome of the evaluation of existing facilities and resulting estimates of cost to correct deficiencies.
  - f) Mr. Lloyd commented that AB 233 requires the Task Force to "make preliminary determinations of acceptable standards for construction, renovation, and remodeling of court facilities." He noted that the principal purposes of developing guidelines are to provide a basis for evaluating existing court facilities and for estimating the costs of renovation and new construction. Staff and consultants, as previously discussed with the Task Force, plan to revise the guidelines to reflect information gained through evaluation of existing facilities and review by other parties throughout the project. Any changes will be brought before the Task Force for approval. The Task Force does not have the authority to formally issue standards nor guidelines for court facilities. This is a responsibility of the Judicial Council. The work plan, however, calls for requesting the Judicial Council's approval of the Task Force's guideline recommendations after completion of the field evaluation of existing court facilities.
  - g) Justice Kremer noted that the Judicial Council is not required to adopt the Task Force's facility guideline recommendations.
  - h) Judge Peterson withdrew his request to present Mr. Yim's review comments prior to a vote since approval of the draft does not preclude future changes.
  - i) Mr. Abel commented that careful attention must be paid to words used when approving staff/consultant's progress. The word "final" should not be used on the guidelines until they are ready for submission to the Judicial Council with a request for formal adoption.
  - j) Supervisor Smith proposed that a preface be added to the interim report, due July 1, 1999, which would explain the purpose and use of the guidelines.
  - k) Justice Kremer added that the preface should indicate that the report reflects the best thought to date. The report should also indicate that the Task Force does not have the authority to formally adopt the guidelines. It should also say that the Task Force will finalize its recommended court facilities guidelines after finishing its evaluation of existing court facilities and will recommend that the Judicial Council officially adopt them.
  - l) Mr. Janssen questioned whether a vote should be taken on the proposed motion since the Task

- Force will be discussing courtroom size later in this meeting.
- m) Supervisor Smith asked if the draft guidelines will be reviewed by interested groups prior to submittal of the interim report on July 1, 1999. Mr. Lloyd replied that the Task Force, at its January 1999 meeting, decided that the draft would not be circulated to interest groups until all sections were reviewed and tentatively agreed to by the Task Force. He noted that interest group review would probably occur after the guidelines are submitted to the Governor, Legislature, and Judicial Council.
  - n) Members requested clarification on the intent of the motion and the impact of taking a vote at this time. Mr. Lloyd stated that the intent of approving the working draft of the courtroom guideline was to give staff and consultants direction on the appropriate structure, format, content, and level of coverage of the guidelines. He noted that the final draft of the entire document would be presented to the Task Force for their approval at a future meeting.
  - o) Mr. Dan Smith asked if the document's format and direction met with the approval of the Task Force. He noted that the CSAC Advisory Group's review comments on the courtroom component will be presented at a future meeting. He added that a working draft of the remaining components will be presented at the May 1999 Task Force meeting. The Task Force revisions will subsequently be incorporated into a complete working draft of the guideline, which will be presented to the Task Force for approval. It will then be sent to interest groups for their review and comment.
  - p) A motion was made to approve the courtroom component guidelines as revised by the Task Force at its January 1999 meeting. Justice Kremer called for a vote. The motion was approved. Fourteen members voted "yes", Mr. Janssen, voted no, and three members were absent (Senator Escutia, Supervisor Bechtel, and Mr. Aitken). Mr. Janssen said he dissented because he felt a vote was more appropriate at the end of the day, when discussion of the courtroom components was completed.
- 5) The next item discussed was whether county law libraries should be considered a court function that the Task Force would address in its study.
- a) Judge Peterson presented the Standards and Evaluation Committee's recommendations that:
    - (1) The county law library not be considered a court function and not be included in the Task Force's work, and
    - (2) The guidelines note that county law libraries should be co-located with the court and that sufficient space be provided in the courthouse, as permitted by budget. This recognizes the need for their services and their important relationship with the court.
  - b) Mr. Janssen stated that he believed the county law libraries were beyond the scope and responsibility of the Task Force.
  - c) Supervisor Smith motioned that the Task Force not consider county law libraries a court function, but include in its recommended guidelines a functional relationship between the libraries and the courts similar to the relationship between the courts and other justice agencies (e.g. public defender and district attorney). The guidelines should encourage inclusion of these related functions within the physical boundaries of the courthouse when budget and space allow. Specific facility guidelines would not be established for these "related" justice agencies. The motion was approved unanimously.
- 6) Justice Kremer and Mr. Lloyd reported on past and future presentations made to various groups on Task Force activities.
- a) Presentations were made to the CSAC Administration of Justice Committee, and the California Judicial Administration Conference.
  - b) Justice Kremer will make a short presentation at the April 7 CSAC general conference. Mr. Dan Smith will present to the County Administrators as an adjunct to the CSAC conference on April 8.
- 7) An overview of the Task Force meeting agenda was presented. The main presentation will focus on Phase 2 standards development, including courtroom size and layout. Tours of the Fresno courthouse, and committee meetings will occupy the remainder of the 2-day session.

## **II. SCHEDULE AND WORK PLAN REVIEW– Mr. Dan Smith**

- 1) Mr. Smith briefly reviewed the project schedule and goals for future Task Force meetings, highlighting progress and upcoming events / milestones.

## **III. PRESENTATION - Dr. Phillip Nyberg, League of California Cities representative**

- 1) The presentation was cancelled due to unforeseen travel difficulty encountered by Mr. Nyberg.
- 2) Mr. Janssen noted that cities, not just rural towns, want to fight to keep their courthouses. He recommended that the League of California Cities presentation be rescheduled to a future meeting. The Task Force concurred and directed staff to reschedule the presentation.

## **IV. PHASE 2: STANDARDS –THE COURTROOM – Mr. Dan Smith, Mr. Don Dwore and Mr. Ken Jandura**

- 1) The Phase II discussion of courtroom sizes was started earlier than scheduled because of the unforeseen cancellation of the League of California Cities' presentation.
- 2) Mr. Dwore and Mr. Jandura gave a brief slide show of courtroom design, focusing on the physical elements and functional relationships that define the space requirements and size of the courtroom. The presentation included federal and other state court facilities.
- 3) Mr. Smith noted that the 1600-1800 net square feet (nsf) range for a multi-purpose courtroom is commonly used. The size of the litigation area and the number of people seated in the public area drive the total courtroom size. The minimum size of the litigation area is a function of the size of the bench, jury box, witness stand, clerk's/bailiff's workstation, and attorneys' tables and the separation and site lines required to make the space function.
- 4) Mr. Janssen commented that he would like to discuss the impact a minimum courtroom size 1500 nsf would have on courtroom operations compared to the proposed 1600 nsf. He noted that a sketch with specific dimensions and separation distances for a 1500 nsf courtroom would facilitate this discussion.
- 5) To keep on schedule, Justice Kremer halted the discussion noting that this topic would be continued in the afternoon, after individual committee meetings.

## **V. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

- 1) There was no public comment at this session.

## **VI. LUNCH PRESENTATION – Mr. Ernest Pauline and Mr. Mike Weinberg**

- 1) Mr. Pauline, the Assistant Court Executive for the Superior Court of Fresno County, and Mr. Weinberg discussed unification, funding, and new construction for the Superior Court of Fresno County.
- 2) Mr. Weinberg noted that many of their courtrooms are too small for multi-litigant cases and the effective use of technology. In addition to their size, the functional layout, separation distances, poor sight lines, and lack of infrastructure make it difficult to try such cases. Mr. Janssen asked if justice was adequately served in the deficient courtrooms. Mr. Weinberg responded that labor intensive solutions were normally employed to mitigate the deficiencies.

## **VII. COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

- 1) The Task Force adjourned into committees. Committee meeting reports are attached.

**VIII. PHASE 2: STANDARDS –THE COURTROOM (continued)– Mr. Dan Smith, Mr. Don Dwore and Mr. Ken Jandura**

- 1) Mr. Dwore and Mr. Jandura presented several sketches of courtroom layouts reflecting the proposed guidelines including the size of defining elements, relationships and separation distances (attached). The remainder of the discussion was based on these sketches.
- 2) It was noted that the depth of the litigation area is driven by the size of the bench, distance behind the bench needed to comply with American with Disability Act (ADA) requirements, the length of the jury box and separation between the bar and the witness box. The width is driven by the size of jury box, separation between the jury box and attorneys' tables, and separation between the prosecution and defense tables. The resulting recommendation is a litigation area that is 32 feet deep by 36 feet wide for a total of 1152 nsf.
- 3) Mr. Cupples stated that the multi-purpose use of the typical courtroom should be kept in mind when considering the size guidelines. Reducing the size from the proposed 1600 to 1800 nsf range would result in a courtroom with limited seating with little flexibility. He added that the rising numbers of exhibits and multiple party cases has increased the space needed in a courtroom over the last 10 years.
- 4) Mr. Dan Smith noted that courthouses with multiple courtrooms could have a mix of courtroom types and sizes that reflect types of cases the court handles. A reduced size courtroom, however, limits its flexibility.
- 5) It was noted that the sketches do not show the bailiff and court reporter stations.
- 6) Judge Wick stated that a diagram showing ramps and/or lifts would be helpful to envision their configuration and spatial impact. She also suggested including typical courtroom designs in the guidelines. Mr. Lloyd replied that the inclusion of typical courtroom diagrams may be interpreted as design requirements and that schematic diagrams that illustrate functional relationships and minimum separations may be more appropriate. He felt that the courts and their architects should have substantial latitude in determining the design that best meets the local needs. Mr. Cupples added his concern that including detailed floorplans could predetermine the design of all courtrooms.
- 7) Mr. Abel remarked that these sketches, with the basic minimum ADA clearances, support the consultants' courtroom size recommendations by demonstrating required sizes of courtroom elements, desired physical separation distances and necessary circulation of participants.
- 8) Mr. Cupples noted that a smaller court would cause required ramps or lifts to encroach upon the "well" space, diminishing the space available for attorneys to present their case and display exhibits. He also noted that theater seating takes up more space than bench seating, however most people prefer theater seating because of the additional space and comfort. He added that minimum sizes tend to become maximums.
- 9) Mr. Smith noted that the existing standard of 1500 nsf for the courtroom is functional but provides minimal public seating and limits flexibility of use. Justice Kremer added that the guidelines should state the compromises incurred with the use of this size courtroom.

**IX. COURT TOUR – Mr. Ernest Pauline and Mr. Mike Weinberg**

- 1) Mr. Pauline and Mr. Weinberg gave a guided tour of the Fresno County Courthouse and its courtrooms.
- 2) The Task Force met in a courtroom and continued the discussion of courtroom guidelines. The consultant pointed out the key features and distances discussed during the afternoon meeting; comparing and contrasting them with the courtroom's actual sizes and features. This provided the Task Force members with a better understanding of the proposed sizes, sightlines, and separation distances.

**DAY 2 – Thursday, March 25, 1999**

**X. PHASE 2: STANDARDS THE COURTROOM (continued) AND OTHER COMPONENTS– Mr. Dan Smith**

- 1) Mr. Smith opened the discussion by noting that the sections of the guidelines are a working draft for Task Force review. While the consultants are seeking the Task Force's approval of the draft guidelines, they recognize that changes can and will be made in the future. AB 233 requires the Task Force to provide the Legislature, Judicial Council and Governor with their "preliminary

- determination of acceptable standards” by July 1, 1999. The work plan recognizes that the guidelines may change during the course of the field evaluation of existing court facilities as additional information is learned. The consultants hope is that the changes will be minor.
- 2) Based on the discussion of the earlier courtroom sketches, Mr. Smith suggested including spatial relationship diagrams in the guidelines to illustrate the requirements. Justice Kremer added that the purpose and use of the drawings, if included, should be addressed in the guidelines. Mr. Smith commented that consultants, who have read the existing standards, have remarked on the lack of graphics.
  - 3) The members continued the discussion of courtroom size:
    - a) Mr. Janssen said that the benefits of using a 1600 nsf courtroom compared to a 1500 nsf courtroom should be stated. He also suggested that the size of the litigation area be stated as the minimum and that different capacities and sizes for spectator seating be included in the guidelines so that the courtroom size can be adjusted to reflect different public seating needs.
    - b) Mr. Cupples suggested that an explanation of the courtroom size ranges be included in the guidelines as well as how case type, local jurisdiction and culture affect the size of a courtroom.
    - c) Mr. Smith noted that it is important that the minimum litigation area of 1150 nsf be clearly specified.
    - d) Justice Kremer proposed that the Task Force accept a guideline for the multipurpose courtroom that sets a minimum size of 1150 nsf for the litigation area with seating areas ranging from 350 nsf to 650 nsf depending on the expected audience size. This would result in a guideline of 1500 to 1800 nsf. A motion to approve this proposal was made, seconded, and approved unanimously.
  - 4) The Task Force discussed the use of such terms as “must” and “should” in light of their earlier decision to develop court facility guidelines as opposed to standards. The members felt that care must be taken to use terms that reflect the relative importance of different guidelines without mandating them. Staff was directed to review the draft guidelines and change the wording to reflect this goal.
  - 5) Mr. Lloyd emphasized that the guidelines will be the benchmark for new construction, and that the guidelines for evaluating existing facilities have not been developed as yet.
  - 6) Mr. Dan Smith stated that the Federal court facility standards do not require the bench to be fully accessible in every courtroom. Instead, their standard allows a percentage of benches be built with just space and power for lifts, should they be needed. Mr. Smith said that California has consistently required all benches be fully accessible at initial occupancy.
    - a) Mr. Lloyd suggested that the guidelines be simply written to require compliance with current state and federal disability regulations, citing specific federal and state codes. Mr. Lloyd also stated that staff would formally request the State Architect’s interpretation of whether every bench must be fully accessible at occupancy..
    - b) Mr. Janssen asked if “handicapped” and “disabled” were the proper terms to use in the guidelines. Mr. Lloyd responded that staff will research this question.
  - 7) Security in the courtroom was discussed next.
    - a) Ms. Campos suggested that the court reporter and bailiff stations include bullet resistant protection. Mr. Smith responded that another part of the proposed guidelines will detail security specifics. He noted that the Security Working Group chartered by the Standards and Evaluation Committee is doing a detailed review of security issues for possible inclusion in the guidelines and that he expects their input before completion of the guidelines.
    - b) Mr. Cupples noted that redundancy in security measures is often necessary since, typically, only the public goes through magnetometer screening. The security risk is increased if employees and attorneys are not screened. Mr. Abel noted that many courts do not have any perimeter screening, so bullet resistant protection should be used at the judge, clerk, witness and jury box areas.
    - c) Judge Wick suggested that the court reporter station be moveable so that it can be located according to the judge’s and court reporter’s preferences.
    - d) A motion was made that the guidelines include bullet resistant protection for the bench, witness box and clerk’s workstation and that such protection be considered for the jury box,

bailiff's workstation, and court reporter's workstation. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

- 8) Mr. Klass was concerned that the electrical section, pages 29 through 31, was too specific. Justice Kremer suggested replacing this section with a checklist as an appendix to the guidelines.
- 9) Mr. Dan Smith noted that the jury deliberation room was included in the courtroom section since it is an integral part of the proceedings. He noted that one jury deliberation room for each courtroom may not be necessary for larger courthouses with multiple courtrooms. The proposed guideline was one jury room for every courtroom when a courthouse has less than five; a ratio of three jury rooms per four courtrooms in courthouses with six to twenty courtrooms; and three jury rooms per five courtrooms in courthouses with twenty-one or more courtrooms. Mr. Abel noted that this seems arbitrary and asked for the "science" behind the numbers. Mr. Smith replied that the proposed ratio is an industry standard. Mr. Cupples added that the source of the proposed ratios is the Massachusetts and New York standards. Mr. Abel suggested that a 1:2 or 1:3 ratio of jury rooms to courtrooms may be more desirable.
  - a) It was pointed out that jury rooms are often used for other purposes than jury deliberations because of a lack of general-purpose conference space. General-purpose conference rooms are often sacrificed in courthouse design due to budget constraints. Mr. Cupples suggested that jury rooms have both private and public access to increase their flexibility.
  - b) Justice Kremer suggested that the guidelines have jury room ratios that allow for variations in court operations. Mr. Smith stated that a one jury room to two courtroom ratio would meet most court's needs, but that the ratio should be adjustable based upon local operational needs.
  - c) The proposed guidelines recommended a single, unisex restroom for each jury room. Mr. Lloyd stated that he believed the building code requires separate facilities for each sex based upon the number of people served (fourteen). Staff was directed to review code requirements for restrooms and adjust the guidelines accordingly.
  - d) Ms. Campos suggested that the guidelines discuss the need for audio video equipment in jury deliberation rooms. The equipment is required for viewing exhibits that were presented during trial.
- 10) Chapter IV – Judicial Officer's Suite was discussed next.
  - a) Task Force members felt that the word "suite" in the section title gave an impression of luxury rather than necessity and should be replaced with a more appropriate word or phrase.
  - b) Staff was directed to replace "judge demands" with "judge requires" under section 1a.
  - c) The members felt that the pros and cons of clustering chambers should be discussed in the guidelines and presented as an alternative to placing chambers next to each courtroom.
  - d) Mr. Lloyd proposed replacing "soundproof" with a more appropriate term and providing performance standards for noise transmission reduction as an alternative to providing a vestibule (page 33).
  - e) Mr. Janssen proposed that the first sentence discussing the chamber's restroom be replaced with the sentence that is in the California Trial Court Facilities Standards (1991): "Private restroom facilities should be provided in each judge's chamber." He recommended that the discussion of restrooms for clustered chambers be retained.
  - f) Members agreed that the conference room section (page 34) should be revised to reflect a ratio of one conference room per 5 to 8 judges. The sentences that address heating, ventilating, and air conditioning; finish; and accessibility is redundant with other parts of the guidelines and should be deleted.

- g) It was suggested that “secretary” be replaced with a more appropriate term or phrase such as “administrative support area” to avoid implying that each judge must have a secretary. Members also felt that the only security requirements for a secretary’s workstation are a clear visual field of people entering the chambers and a silent duress button. The requirement for a security camera, security computer and intercom should be deleted.
  - h) The members agreed that conventional furniture (chairs, desks, tables, etc.) should not, typically, be addressed in the guidelines unless it plays a critical role in the function of a space. However, systems furniture requirements should be discussed.
  - i) Judge Peterson recommended that law clerk workstations be close to chambers and not the law library.
  - j) Mr. Abel suggested that “judge” be replaced with “judicial officer” throughout the guidelines.
  - k) Mr. Smith proposed that “minimum” square footage of office space be replaced with “approximate” square footage. He added that the local culture and utilization of support staff must be considered when planning chambers so that the correct number and size of staff work areas are included in the design. Mr. Lloyd proposed that staff research the State’s Department of General Services’ office and workstation standards for use as a benchmark in discussing court facility guidelines.
  - l) Judge Wick noted that financial constraints may encourage clustering to better utilize shared support staff.
  - m) Staff was requested to research the amount of file space required for chambers. Judge Peterson noted that each of the judges in his court have files that line an entire wall of their office that is approximately 15’ long by 9’ in high.
  - n) Members asked that the reception/waiting area be combined with the secretary workstation station. Mr. Clarke added that a buffer area is necessary to prevent unauthorized access to documents being used by staff..
- 11) Chapter V –Jury Assembly Area:
- a) Mr. Janssen questioned whether all the equipment listed for potential jurors use would be required if “one day / one trial” legislation is enacted. He thought that this section should be written in more general terms.
  - b) Mr. Clarke suggested requiring a jury assembly room at each court facility. Mr. Freeman questioned the need for requiring jury assembly rooms in rural courts.
- 12) Section VI - Court Reporter’s Area:
- a) Members asked that a preface be added to the section explaining that courts often contract for court reporting services, which may affect their need for space in the courthouse.
  - b) “Private office” should be replaced with “work area” eliminating any preference for offices or workstations.
  - c) Security of court reporters privately owned equipment should be addressed.
- 13) Ms. Campos stated that it would be helpful to see a mockup or actual courtroom that emulated the guidelines proposed for a general-purpose courtroom. Mr. Clarke agreed and offered to find a courtroom in Los Angeles that closely matches the minimum size proposed for the litigation area. The Task Force could then visit the courtroom during its May meeting. A suggested alternative was to find a mock courtroom at a law school. Staff was directed to work with the Los Angeles courts to find a suitable courtroom for this purpose.
- 14) Mr. Smith stated that the working draft of sections 3 through 6 will be rewritten to incorporate the Task Force’s direction and distributed to members within two weeks. These sections can, then, be formally approved at the start of the next meeting. Mr. Smith also noted that the next draft of these sections will omit the “underlines” and “strikeouts” that indicate revisions to the “California Trial Court Facilities Standards (1991).” “Underlines” and “Strikeouts” on future drafts of sections 3 through 6 will indicate changes to previous version of the draft guidelines. Working drafts of guideline sections 1, 2 and 7 through 14 will be presented at the next Task Force meeting.



- XI.** It was suggested that June 16 be set aside by Task Force members for a possible meeting to finalize the working draft of the “preliminary” guidelines before submission of the Task Force’s interim report due July 1, 1999. The meeting, if held, would be from 10:00 AM – 4:00 PM in Sacramento.

**XII. PRESENTATION – Justice James Ardaiz, Court of Appeal, 5<sup>th</sup> District & Ms. Judy Myers, Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)**

- 1) Justice Ardaiz, chair of the Task Force on Trial Court Employees, and Ms. Myers, Director of AOC’s Human Resources Bureau, presented an overview of their Task Force’s mission, issues and progress. The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (the Act) established the state’s responsibility for funding trial court operations. The Act also created the Task Force on Trial Court Employees. The Task Force is developing recommendations for “a plan to transition existing court employees into an appropriate employment status, recognizing the state assumption of trial court costs. Among the Task Force’s main goals are achieving a uniform yet flexible personnel system. The Task Force has sent a survey to all counties to collect data on the different personnel and benefits systems currently in place in the trial courts. This information will be used in developing the various options and recommendation for personnel and benefits systems. As required by the ACT, an advisory vote by trial court employees on the Task Force’s recommendation will be taken and included in their report to the Legislature, Governor, and Judicial Council.

**XIII. PRESENTATION – PROPOSED CSAC LEGISLATION -Supervisor Jerry Eaves, San Bernardino County**

- 1) Supervisor Eaves reported that CSAC intends to pursue legislation to insure that counties expending resources on court facility construction will be reimbursed if responsibility for court facilities is transferred to the state. Specifically, the proposed legislation would amend Government Code section 77654 to provide that if “the state assumes full responsibility for court facilities after June 30, 2001, a county shall be reimbursed for costs incurred by the county for new court facilities constructed between July 1, 1997 and June 30, 2001. Supervisor Eaves asked for Task Force support of the legislation.
- 2) It was noted that the language should specifically define what costs would be reimbursed should the state take over court facilities.
- 3) The Task Force members did not take a position on the proposed legislation. However, they authorized the chair to write a letter stating that the Task Force believes the CSAC proposal to be appropriately within the purview of the Legislature and that nothing within the Task Force’s charge or work should impede the Legislature’s timely consideration of the proposal.

**XIV. COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS**

- 1) **Standards and Evaluations Committee – Judge Wayne Peterson**
  - a) Judge Peterson stated that the four working groups chartered by the Standards Committee are actively working on recommendations for technology, security, unification’s impact on court facilities, and appellate court facility guidelines.
- 2) **Needs Analysis and Projections Committee – Mr. Anthony Tyrrell**
  - a) At Mr. Tyrrell’s request, Mr. Woodard reported that the committee listened to representatives of San Diego, Riverside, and Sutter Counties’ courts who discussed their individual experiences with coordination and consolidation. Each of these counties had administratively consolidated their municipal and superior court operations prior to unification.
  - b) The panel members expressed the importance of unification for improved efficiency and lower cost of court operations. The panel indicated that unification had a direct impact on reducing the need for additional judicial officers.
  - c) Mr. Clarke stated that the three representatives believed they had already achieved the benefits of unification through consolidation before the municipal and superior courts merged. He noted that it is hard to quantify the precise impact consolidation had on staffing and expected little additional efficiency gains as a result of the counties’ recent unification.
  - d) Mr. Woodard suggested that these counties’ disposition rates and processing time be studied.

3) **Finance and Implementation Committee – Mr. David Janssen**

- a) Mr. Janssen requested that the Task Force respond to a letter from Judge John Kennedy, Jr., presiding judge of the Superior Court of San Bernardino County, asking the Task Force to consider supporting the Baca Bill, which would add \$50 to civil filing fees. The Task Force decided not to take a position on the merits of the bill but authorized the chair to send a letter stating that the work of the Task Force should not impede the legislature's consideration of this bill since it addresses the immediate needs of the courts. The letter would note that the Task Force is looking at the long term funding and financing of court facilities not immediate needs.
- b) Solomon Smith Barney made a presentation to the committee, outlining alternative financing tools.
- c) The committee discussed who would best be in a position to incur debt, the state or the counties. Debt capacity is an issue that the committee plans to further research.
- d) At the next Task Force meeting the committee will look at different state models.
- e) Mr. Klass offered to distribute the state's capital needs report when it becomes available.

**XV. The meeting adjourned at 3:00PM.**